



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Am*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,014	06/15/2001	Michael Smith	1826 (42059-01360)	9634
20350	7590	04/06/2005	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/883,014	Applicant(s) SMITH, MICHAEL	
	Examiner Etienne P LeRoux	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21/20/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 14-16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 14-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Claim Status***

Claims 8-11, 14-16 and 18-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-7, 12, 13 and 17 have been cancelled. Claims 8, 15, 16 and 18 are currently amended. Claims 8-11, 14-16 and 18-20 are rejected in this office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8-10, 14-16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 5,878,415 issued to Olds (hereafter Olds).

**Claims 8 and 15:**

Olds discloses:

detecting a query from at least one entity over a data network [Fig 1, 32] seeking a first view of at least one address [E-mail address, col 1, line 67] entry in a shared directory [Fig 2, step 40, directory services database 66, Fig 3, col 7, lines 59-65, NDS, col 1, lines 15-22]

retrieving identification information for the at least one entity, wherein the identification information includes hierarchical information associated with the at least one entity [grant or deny access per the access control list 74, col 8, line 61-col 9, line 2]

Art Unit: 2161

denying access to the first view based on the hierarchical information, searching the shared directory to identify all of the at least one entries in the directory which includes the hierarchical information [access constraint propagator 68, Fig 3, col 8, line 61-col 9, line 2]

presenting to the at least one entity initiating the query only, all of the identified at least one address entries in a second view [access granted to many objects in a subtree, col 7, lines 13-20]

Claim 9:

Olds discloses wherein the shared directory is configurable for supporting emessaging [E-mail address, col 1, line 67].

Claim 10:

Olds discloses wherein the entities comprise at least one of at least one person and at least one group [network user, col 1, lines 23-35]

Claim 14 and 19:

Olds discloses wherein the first view is a listing of all entries in the directory and the second view is a copy of the listing with modified selection criteria [administrator is able to make global changes thus has global access, col 3, lines 55-65, user is granted access per the access control list 74, Fig 4, col 8, line 61 – col 9, line 2].

Claim 16:

Olds discloses wherein the data network is the internet and the server is configured to communicate with web browsers [col 6, lines 3-12]

Claim 18:

Art Unit: 2161

Olds discloses wherein the server and directory are configured to provide hosted messaging services for a plurality of third parties [Fig 1, 20,col 6, line 44 – 58]

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olds in view of Pub No US 2002/0104018 issued to Singhani et al (hereafter Singhani).

Claims 11 and 20:

Olds discloses the elements of claim 8 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the hierarchal information includes at least one of company name and company location. Singhani discloses wherein the hierarchal information includes at least one of company name and company location [paragraph 57]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Olds to include wherein the hierarchal information includes at least one of company name and company location as taught by Singhani for the purpose of providing necessary information for the purposes of approving/rejecting by an application administrator a request by a user for access to an application [paragraph 57].

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/20/2004 have been fully considered and are partially persuasive based on applicant's most recent amending of the claims to include an address entry of an entity accessing a shared directory. Based on above applicant's amending of the claims, examiner provides supra new art rejection (US Pat No 5,878,415 issued to Olds) which discloses providing limited access to users of a directory service database. Olds discloses controlling access to objects in a hierarchical database. Olds clearly discloses limiting access based on the e-mail address of a user. Olds further discloses granting global access to network administrators. In the secondary reference, Singhani similarly discloses restricting access to network users based on the e-mail address of the user. Further, Singhani discloses that a user's company is required for a user's authentication.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2161

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Etienne LeRoux

4/3/2005

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1100